DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 362 083 HE 026 691

AUTHOR	Ludwig, Meredith Jane
TITLE	Helping Institutions Help Themselves. The AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Aug 90
CONTRACT	P116P80900
NOTE	62p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Cooperation; College Programs; Databases; Data Collection; *Demonstration Programs; Higher Education; Information Dissemination; Information Needs; Information Services; Models; *Program Descriptions; *State Colleges; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*AASCU ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project; American Association of State Colleges and Univs; *Database Development; ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education

ABSTRACT

This final report describes activities of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) in a 3-year collaboration with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education to acquire information on model programs within the ERIC database for access by ERIC clients. AASCU members frequently need information on model programs and since ERIC has an organization and staff to implement information databases and AASCU has the means to attract program information to ERIC, the partnership emerged. the project resulted in the production of: a copy of all 247 program abstracts, a set of microfiche, and a file of copies of program descriptions. Additionally, presentations were made about the project and an analysis of program characteristics was performed. Among findings were: about 41 percent were in the discipline of education; 55 percent reported on the federal sources of funding for their projects; most programs not receiving federal support were funded by the institution itself; and 39 percent of programs remain active. Project participants reported they knew about and valued ERIC but few reported regular use of the database. Some increased interest in and use of ERIC was indicated. Appended are the guidelines for program inclusion, the program characteristics summary, the texts of articles written about the project, a list of participating projects, and a project evaluation instrument. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 362 083

FINAL REPORT

HELPING INSTITUTIONS HELP THEMSELVES

THE AASCU/ERIC MODEL PROGRAMS INVENTORY PROJECT

HE 026 691

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Cover	1
Project Summary	2
Project Overview	3
Project Purpose	4
Project Description: Year One	4
Stage One	4
Stage Two	5
Stage Three	6
Stages Four and Five	7
Stages Six and Seven	7
Project Description: Year Two	7
Year Two Goals	8
Year Two Program Solicitations	8
Project Results	9
Project Products	9
Dissemination of Project Results	9
Project Evaluation	10
In-House Database	10
Tabular Results of PCS Analysis	13
Participant and User Awareness	15
Summary and Conclusions	17
Appendices	
A: Inventory Parts A and B	
B: Special Reports in Memo:to the president	
C: List of Participating Projects	
D: Evaluation Instruments	

Cover Sheet

Grantee Organization:	American Association of State Colleges and Universities One Dupont Circle, Suite 700 Washington, D.C. 20036
Grant Number:	#P116P80900
Project Dates:	Starting Date: September 1, 1988 Ending Date: August 31, 1990 Number of Months: 24
Project Director:	Meredith Ludwig, Director of Association Research AASCU One Dupont Circle, Suite 700 Washington, D.C. 20036
FIPSE Project Officers:	David Arnold
Grant Award:	Year 1 $36,021 Year 2 $34,193 TOTAL $70,214

Project Summary

College and university faculty and administrators frequently rely on program description information in their own program planning and implementation process. As an education and service organization to the chief executives of public colleges and universities, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) responds to many requests for program models. A cost-effective partnership was developed between AASCU and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, whereby AASCU would call for and collect program descriptions and submit them to the ERIC system for abstracting and indexing. Two hundred and forty-seven program models were collected over two years through announcements in the AASCU newsletter and mailings to program contacts and Academic Vice Presidents at member institutions. Since ERIC had set a maximum of 300 program descriptions it could accept in the two-year grant period, the project goal was felt to be accomplished. The program descriptions were entered into the ERIC database with an AASCU identifier and a descriptive cover sheet which is printed each time an abstract is requested by the database searcher. Evaluations were done of the resources in the in-house database developed from program information submitted on the Program Characteristics Summary (PCS). Surveys of inventory participants and librarians at member institutions were also conducted as part of the final evaluation.

Meredith Jane Ludwig, Director of Association Research
AASCU
One Dupont Circle, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7070

FINAL REPORT

Project Overview

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) in collaboration with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education proposed to develop a base of information on model programs within ERIC for access by ERIC clients. At least two aspects of this proposal were innovative: the partnership with ERIC and the determination to provide program model descriptions within ERIC matching the information needs of colleges and universities.

As an Association, AASCU has a number of individual offices concerned with data development and information development, including the Office of Federal Programs (a subscription service to colleges and universities that helps institutional grants officers identify funding opportunities for faculty) and an Office of Association Research which conducts surveys on policies and programs and maintains databases for research on behalf of its members, the press and the public. The most difficult data to collect and maintain is program description information. Since ERIC has an organization and staff to accomplish this task and AASCU has the means to attract program information to ERIC from its members, the partnership between the two organizations seemed to be the most cost-effective approach to provide program resources to the clients of ERIC, many of whom are faculty at the nation's public colleges and universities.

AASCU was also aware that when institutions begin to develop proposals for program planning they are limited in their support resources. They cannot travel around the country to study other programs. They get on the telephone and develop a network of individuals and organizations working on related issues. AASCU is frequently called and ERIC is seldom used.

To respond to these needs, ERIC offered to accept 150 program descriptions a year into the database. The effort would be called a program inventory. The name of AASCU would become an identifier so that public colleges and universities could obtain a better match between their program needs and the available models. AASCU offered to develop a process and instruments for the collection of program information and descriptions and then to take responsibility for their submission to ERIC.

No organizational changes were required to accomplish these

objectives, however, support for staffing the project on the AASCU side was requested from FIPSE because the staff resources in the Office of Association Research were limited. Indeed this has prohibited the comprehensive collection of program information that was deemed necessary to be of the most value to the member institutions.

Project Purpose

There were four objectives for the project over two years:

- to increase the information on model programs available to all institutions through the ERIC system;
- to encourage the use of the ERIC system by AASCU member institutions;
- to improve AASCU's ability to know about and share information on activities at member institutions; and
- to test a model for collaboration with ERIC that other national organizations might adopt.

The objectives of the project attempted to go beyond the original need, to center program resources in ERIC. It was clear that increased use of ERIC would help the project in two ways; institutions would see the benefit/incentive of participating in the inventory and would find other resources in ERIC useful for their research and program development. The professional staff at AASCU also had a need to work with ERIC more often, and information about ERIC and training in its search capabilities were to be part of the benefits to staff. The idea was to create a ripple effect for the use of ERIC as a resource.

Project Description: Year One

The two-year project activities were organized by stages. Brief descriptions of these stages and the activities in each follow.

Stage One

The most time-consuming portion of the first stage was the compilation of lists of federally funded model programs containing useful contact information. It was necessary to start with such a list to send the first solicitation to model programs funded within the previous four years by the federal government. Information from AASCU's Office of Federal Programs was used and individuals within federal agencies contacted to provide awards lists.

Using information from 15 agencies, a database was created of 450 programs. This was used for mailing the first letter describing the project and the guidelines for submitting program information to the inventory project. Guidelines for inclusion in ERIC (called Part A) and an instrument to collect objective data on the programs for an AASCU database (called Part B or the Program Characteristics Summary, PCS) were developed with feedback from AASCU staff. The PCS was created as an answer to the problem of storing program information in a condensed and meaningful manner. We did not want to duplicate ERIC's work in abstracting and indexing, but we wanted to have on hand some basic characteristics of the programs to report and to evaluate the effort. Examples of these instruments are provided in Appendix A.

The definition of "model program" evolved from discussions with staff and with the FIPSE project officer. The definition was operationalized by three questions:

> Does the project or program offer a unique or creative solution to a common problem or a new approach to a common concern in the education community? Does the new approach or unique solution work; that is, has the program or project been a success within the framework for which it was designed? Would the program or project be replicable at other postsecondary institutions?

The Association newsletter was used to inform all member institutions about the project. In addition, the ERIC staff came to the AASCU annual meeting in 1988 to demonstrate its services.

Stage Two

In Stage Two, the initial mailing to project contacts was made. A cover letter to the mailing stated the purpose of the project and asked prospective participants to consider their projects in light of the definition of model programs provided. In addition, a solicitation was mailed to directors of projects on teaching and learning which had been submitted to the Mitau Award competition for innovative programs, an AASCU award program. Programs received in the late winter were submitted to ERIC for indexing and abstracting. A follow-up mailing was done to increase interest and submissions. The program descriptions received during this first half-year of the project were assigned ED numbers in the summer of 1989. ED numbers are ERIC's numbering system, similar to an archival system, which allows searchers to retrieve the actual documents from microfiche or to request and receive printed copies of the documents.

During the winter of 1989, special reports appeared in the Association's newsletter about the project and included a list of institutions and contacts which had already responded. See Appendix B for examples of these reports. Because the response

rate had been so limited (only about 85 program descriptions were received from the 450 in the original contacts database and 34 from the Mitau project mailing) an evaluation of the solicitation process was planned to improve the instruments, guidelines, and means of contacting prospective inventory participants. This was undertaken in Stage Three.

Stage Three

A consultant was hired to create a database management system to store and retrieve the data from the Program Characteristics Summary. One of the goals of the project was to make information about model programs more accessible to staff. We needed a menu-driven database and report system created for the peculiarities of the PCS data. It had to be a living system, that is, one that could be updated as new programs came in, as well as accessed for project reports.

Using datatrieve, a Vax-based programming language, the database and entry procedures were created. Also, a menu-driven report system was created allowing searches of the database by project name, by characteristic (or multiples of characteristics), or by ERIC ED number.

The consultant and the AASCU systems manager located the data/report system in the membership information system menu, rendering the database accessible to all staff. The menu-driven system for reporting was completed by the end of the first year of the project and the principal researcher for the project did demonstrations for all staff to show them how to use the system.

The evaluation of the first solicitation took place in April of the first year. The complete results from the surveys can be found in Appendix D. The following is a brief summary of the results.

A random sample of 51 nonrespondents to the first program contact solicitation was selected from the database and each was sent a letter and a short survey. A phone call was then placed to each. Since in the first solicitation we had no response from these individuals, the uncertainty of their responding now was very high. Seventeen returned their surveys and twenty-one individuals called in their responses. Twelve phone calls were made to collect information.

Twenty-nine project contacts had heard of the Model Programs Inventory and received the solicitation, but twenty-two had not received the solicitation. The twenty-one individuals who had not received the solicitation called in and asked for information about

participation. Twenty of the twenty-eight who had received the original mailing said they did not respond because of the timing of the request.

Sixteen of the twenty-eight who had received the original request thought the solicitation for information was somewhat confusing. A major complaint was not knowing how much information to include and the results of the submission process.

A slightly different survey was sent to the individuals who did respond to the first solicitation. Fifteen of the ninety-nine completed program submissions were randomly selected and their contacts telephoned.

The results show that even though these participants felt they had enough time to respond to the solicitation, they too were concerned about the definition of "model program" used and the purpose of the inventory. Thirteen of the respondents reported access to the ERIC system, but only eight actually used it for research.

Stages Four and Five

The modification of the guidelines to integrate results of the evaluation and the PCS to reflect the database and the newly developed reporting system were the chief activities during these next stages.

A second insert (a special report about the project with a call for submission of projects) in the Association newsletter was developed for the summer and enough overruns printed to be mailed to all nonrespondents in the original program contact database (about 700). To obtain better information about project contacts and to disseminate the "Call" to participate in the inventory more widely, the extra copies were mailed to the academic vice presidents of the AASCU member institutions. (The premier copy of the newsletter is mailed to the office of the president/chancellor.) In the corner of the insert, a "buck slip" was simulated to encourage this office to pass the insert on to other offices on campus, such as the chair of the faculty senate.

Stages Six and Seven

The remaining activities in the first year were directed to building staff awareness of the in-house database and increasing the contact with the member colleges and universities about participation in the inventory project. Thank you letters were prepared for the participants. Demonstrations were done for the staff on the completed database. Plans were made for the next year and an annual report to FIPSE was completed.

<u>Project Description: Year Two</u>

Year Two Goals

With one year's experience accomplished, the project staff considered some new ways to achieve the goals of the two-year project, specifically addressing the goals of increased model programs in ERIC and evaluation of the partnership model.

The goals for the project's second year were:

- To build comprehensive resources in ERIC on 7 key program/project focuses
- To disseminate information about the project in appropriate professional settings
- To encourage the use of the in-house and ERIC resources by staff
- To evaluate additional solicitations and the usefulness of the project to the field.

Year Two Program Solicitations

Some revisions were made to the two instruments central to the solicitation process. The guidelines were simplified and the PCS was improved and directly related to the newly developed database. Eight calls were implemented for the second year in specific and general program areas: academic programs, general administration, public affairs, college/university development, college/university facilities planning, school/college cooperation, environmental conservation and management, and assessment and the adult learner.

To improve the solicitation's effectiveness, each time a special insert was prepared for the Association newsletter, a letter was sent to the offices of the academic vice president of member institutions with the inventory guidelines and PCS enclosed, along with a copy of the special report insert.

Publishing the names of the participants in the inventory was thought to be a good strategy to increase the incentive for participation. Therefore, in April 1989 all the participant contacts and institutions were printed in the insert. As the ED numbers were assigned to the documents in ERIC, these participant names, project titles, and ED numbers were printed over a number of insert editions. Thank you letters went to the participants with notification that their document was now in ERIC for retrieval.

Once this pattern of solicitation had begun, it went much more smoothly than the first year of activity. Programs began to be sent at regular intervals. ERIC tends to be inclusive rather than exclusive, so all program submissions that met the guidelines were

sent directly on to ERIC. In a few cases, only the PCS was submitted or incomplete information was provided. For each of these programs, calls were made to the submitter for further information to facilitate the process.

Project Results

Project Products

As part of the project products, the Office of Association Research maintains the following resources describing the programs submitted to ERIC through this inventory:

- A copy of all program abstracts
- A set of microfiche
- A file drawer of copies of program descriptions (one for each program which provided a duplicate at the time of submission).

The chief product (and a benefit for the AASCU membership and staff) remains the database and the system created to access the projects and produce reports based on the data collected on the Program Characteristics Survey (PCS). The report system allows the user to search the database by ED number, by title, by institution, and by project characteristics. Reports are produced which can be viewed by the searcher on the computer screen or printed in hard copy.

Dissemination of Project Results

The AASCU and ERIC staff were partners not only in the execution of the project activities but also in the dissemination about the cooperative nature of this project.

Two presentations were made to sympathetic audiences in the second year of the project. First, the project director spoke to the advisory board of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. Then a presentation was made to the directors and staff of all the ERIC Clearinghouses at their annual meeting in Washington, D.C.

The public affairs office of AASCU prepared a press release that was sent to the public affairs offices of all the member colleges and universities. It was hoped that faculty and staff who do not regularly see the AASCU publications would be informed about the availability of resources in the inventory and in the in-house database through their own public affairs offices.

The project staff also considered a number of ways to reach faculty directly. These ideas were submitted to FIPSE as a proposal in February of 1990 during the FIPSE dissemination

competition. Four ways to reach faculty directly were proposed: additional mailings to faculty chairs and directors of university grants and contracts offices; acquiring a mailbox on the GTE network to communicate with faculty about the inventory resources and use of ERIC; attendance at national conferences to display the inventory resources and seek information about model programs from attenders; and the joint AASCU/ERIC development of special bibliographies and digests about the topics covered in the inventory, describing the trends in programs addressing specific problems.

Unfortunately, after calling for and receiving the dissemination proposals, FIPSE informed us of its plans to change the way it supported additional dissemination efforts. Our proposed activities were not funded.

Project Evaluation

There were three efforts to evaluate the project results at the end of the second year. The characteristics of the projects submitted were evaluated. There were also two surveys of audiences for the inventory: a survey of librarians at AASCU institutions where ERIC search capability is available and a survey of inventory participants to determine the extent of interest in their project generated through participation in the inventory.

In-House Database

One hundred and twenty-seven public colleges and universities submitted a total of 247 model programs eligible to be submitted to ERIC under the guidelines of the project. Since the initial agreement between AASCU and ERIC set a limit of 300 model programs that could be abstracted and indexed in the two years of the project, this final count was considered very satisfactory by both partners. However, when it is compared with the approximately 800 programs we were able to identify from a variety of sources at the beginning of the project, it is clearly only a drop in the bucket. (Appendix C provides a complete list of the projects in the database.)

At least a half dozen project descriptions were not sufficiently complete to be submitted to ERIC. Repeated calls were made to the contacts to obtain the additional or revised material, however, the responses were not obtained and these were not submitted.

Using the categories describing the programs (see Appendix A for a sample of the PCS used to collect this data) on the PCS, an analysis of the submissions was done.

About forty-one percent of the programs were characterized as

being in the discipline of education. The primary target audience for the projects was students, as indicated by the percent of institutions (56 percent) choosing this characteristic. The second audience most often selected by the participants in the inventory was faculty (35 percent). As an audience the "students" varied widely from high school to college students, to faculty who were students themselves in professional development programs. Other major audiences included special groups of learners, such as adults, teachers and state officials.

When the audience was a special target population, twenty-one percent of our participants indicated that black students were the special population involved in their programs. Other special target populations included latchkey kids, the elderly, the gifted learner, freshmen at the institution, and rural populations.

The scope of forty percent of the programs was described as local. Nearly the same percentage of participants reported their scope as either institutional or departmental.

About fifty-five percent of the projects reported on the federal sources of funding for their projects. Of federal agencies provided on the PCS, FIPSE was the most often cited source of funding (11 percent) and the National Science Foundation (NSF) was next, at 8 percent. Some federal sources specified by participants which were not listed on the PCS included the Women's Educational Equity Act, the Small Business Administration, and the Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act.

Nearly fifty-three percent of the model programs with nonfederal sources of funding reported their source as the institution itself. State funding and foundation funding were also clearly important as sources to the model programs, however, the gap between any one of these sources and the institutional was about thirty-seven percentage points. Other nonfederal sources included fees for service, school districts, and non-profit organizations such as the United Way.

Forty-two percent of the programs in the inventory use nonfederal funds exclusively to support their projects.

One question repeatedly asked when studying innovative programs is about their expected life and another about the possibility of institutionalization. The PCS provides us with some information about the life of these model programs. For example, thirty-nine percent of the programs in the inventory describe themselves as currently active. Some of these date back to the 1970s. Slightly over a third of the programs remain active with original funding. Twenty-two percent of the programs are active under their original institutional support. In nine percent of the programs, although original funding ended, the program was continued with other external resources.

For nineteen percent of the programs, institutional resources are keeping the program alive even though the original funding has ended. This group of programs makes up sixty-seven percent of all programs continued when original support ended.

A small percentage--4.5 percent--of the programs reported that when funding ended, the program was completed. An even lower percentage--1.2 percent--reported suspending the program temporarily. The fate of these programs is worthy of additional study.

Tabular data describing the program contacts responses to the components of the Program Characteristics Summary follows.

Regional Distribution of Programs in the Inventory

Region = Far West	Count = 14
Region = Great Lakes	Count = 15
Region = Mid Atlantic	Count = 29
Region = New England	Count = 4
Region = Plains	Count = 12
Region = Rocky Mountains	Count = 10
Region = Southeast	Count = 33
Region = Southwest	Count = 10

Profiles of AASCU institutions that provided descriptions of their model programs compared with all AASCU institutions

Fall 1990 Enrollment Category	Institutions that Provided Model Programs	All AASCU Institutions
Less than 3,000 students	10.2%	18.8%
3,000 - 4,999 students	12.7%	18.5%
5,000 - 9,999 students	32.2%	33.0%
10,000 - 19,999 students	30.5%	23.9%
Over 20,000 students	14.4%	6.0%

Fall 1987 E & G Category (not including scholarships)	Institutions that Provided Model Programs	All AASCU Institutions
Less than $10,000,000	9.9%	15.1%
$10,000,000 - $24,999,999	23.1%	34.6%
$25,000,000 - $49,999,999	34.7%	31.9%
$50,000,000 - $99,999,999	17.4%	12.7%
Over $100,000,000	14.9%	5.7%

Program characteristics of model programs

Academic Focus	Percent
Articulation	10.2%
Basic Skills/General Education	22.8%
Continuing Education	15.9%
Curriculum Development/Reform	37.0%
Education for Economic/Technological Challenges	13.0%
Ethics	4.5%
International Education	18.7%
Intercultural Education	15.9%
Remedial Education	6.5%
Student Outcomes Assessment	8.5%
Training	35.0%
Other	30.1%

External Relations Focus	Percent
Collge/School Cooperation	51.2%
Community Relations	34.6%
Corporate Relations	12.6%
Governmental Relations (Federal)	8.1%
Public Relations	16.7%
State Relations	25.3%
Other	12.2%

Facilities Planning Focus	Percent
Energy Conservation	1.6%
Environmental Health/Safety	3.3%
Facilities Construction	2.8%
Housing Management	0.4%
Renovation	2.8%
Other	2.4%

Institutional Administration Focus	Percent
Accreditation, Institutional or Programmatic	13.4%
Admissions, Enrollment Management	8.1%
Information Services Management	2.8%
Legal Services	1.2%
Student Access/Retention	29.7%
System Structure, Management and Governance	4.5%
Telecommunications Systems	4.1%
Transportation	0.4%
Wage and Salary Administration	0.0%
Other	5.3%

Institutional Development Focus	Percent
Annual Giving	2.8%
Cooperative Arrangements	12.2%
Development	7.7%
Strategic Planning	6.1%
Other	7.3%

Personnel Focus	Percent
Affirmative Action	9.3%
Personnel Evaluation	2.4%
Recruiting Policy	6.5%
Other	8.1%

Program Administration Focus	Percent
Career Planning/Placement	11.8%
Continuing Education Management	6.9%
Counseling Services	11.4%
Instructional Technology Utilization	12.2%
Program Planning and Evaluation	22.[illegible]
Other	7.3%

Discipline	Percent	Discipline	Percent
Agribus. & Ag Production	1.2%	Military Sciences	0.0%
Agricultural Sciences	0.8%	Military Technologies	0.0%
Renewable Nat. Resources	2.4%	Multi/Interdiscip. Studies	12.6%
Architect. & Envir. Design	0.4%	Parks & Recreation	2.0%
Area & Ethnic Studies	6.1%	Basic Skills	11.4%
Business & Management	6.9%	Citizenship/Civics	4.9%
Business-Admin Support	2.4%	Health-Related Activities	8.5%
Business-Marketing & Distribution	4.5%	Interpersonal Skills	9.3%
Communications	6.9%	Leisure & Rec. Activities	2.8%
Communications Tech.	6.1%	Personal Awareness	7.7%
Computer & Info Sciences	8.9%	Philosophy & Religion	3.7%
Consumer, Personal, & Related Services	3.3%	Theology	0.4%
Education	40.7%	Physical Science	12.2%
Engineering	1.2%	Science Technologies	5.3%
Engineering/Related Tech.	3.3%	Psychology	10.6%
Foreign Languages	7.7%	Protective Services	1.2%
Health-Allied Health	7.3%	Public Affairs	5.3%
Health Sciences	6.1%	Social Sciences	11.8%
Home Economics	0.8%	Construction Trades	0.0%
Home Ec-Vocational	1.6%	Mechanics & Repairers	0.0%
Industrial Arts	1.6%	Precision Production	0.0%
Law	1.6%	Transportation & Material Moving	0.0%
Letters	6.5%	Visual & Performing Arts	6.5%
Liberal/General Studies	15.9%	All Disciplines	15.0%
Library & Archival Sci.	2.4%	Not Applicable	3.7%
Life Sciences	9.8%	Other	24.0%
Mathematics	8.1%		

Major Target Audience	Percent
Administration	17.9%
Faculty	34.6%
General Public	16.3%
Local Community	18.7%
Parents	10.2%
Primary/Secondary Schools	33.7%
Students	55.7%
Other	22.4%

Special Target Population	Percent
Black	20.7%
Hispanic	15.0%
Native American	6.9%
Other Ethnic Minority	4.9%
Aged/Aging	6.1%
Disabled/Handicapped	8.1%
Disadvantaged	14.6%
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	4.1%
Gender (Male or Female)	8.1%
Other Special Target Population	21.1%
All Minorities	16.3%
No Special Target Population	39.0%

Project/Program Scope	Percent
Department/Campus Unit	34.6%
International	10.2%
Institutional	36.6%
Local	39.8%
National	19.1%
Regional	28.9%
Rural	13.8%
State	22.4%
System	8.5%
Cultural	5.7%
Other	5.3%

Federal Sources of Project/Program Funding	Percent
Administration on Aging (AOA)	2.0%
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Admin. (ADAMHA)	2.4%
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Ed. (FIPSE)	11.4%
Health Careers Opportunities Program (HCOP)	0.4%
National Endowment for the Arts (NEA)	1.2%
National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH)	5.7%
National Inst. on Disability and Rehab. Research (NIDRR)	0.4%
National Science Foundation (NSF)	8.1%
Ofc of Bilingual Ed. & Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA)	2.4%
TRIO	2.0%
Title III	4.9%
Other	18.7%
Not Applicable	26.0%

Non-Federal Sources of Project/Program Funding	Percent
Corporate Donation	8.1%
Endowment	2.8%
Foundation	15.9%
Institution Supported	52.8%
Private Donation	8.9%
State Appropriation	14.2%
State Grant	15.9%
Other	14.2%
Not Applicable	7.3%

Project/Program Status	Percent
Original Funding Active	35.0%
Original Funding Ended -- Program Continued with Other External Resources	8.9%
Original Funding Ended -- Program Continued with Institutional Resources	18.7%
Original Funding Ended -- Project/Program Completed	4.5%
Original Funded Ended -- Project/Program Suspended Temporarily	1.2%
Program/Project Active Under Original Institutional Support	22.0%
Other	11.4%

The PCS requested information on the focus of the project/program being submitted. There were 7 general areas provided and inventory participants identified their programs by any one or a combination of descriptive focuses.

Under the general category of academic focus, the greatest percentage of participants indicated curriculum development or reform and then training. For example, Empire State College submitted their model "Individualized Education" program; Massachusetts College of Art a program entitled "Moving Minority Art into the Mainstream;" West Virginia State College, a model program for the development of a new general education curriculum; and University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire a program to develop "Critical Thinking and Values Analysis across the Disciplines."

Fifty-one percent of programs submitted to the inventory reportedly had the external relations focus of school/college cooperation. For example, CUNY and the Board of Education of New York City submitted a description of their program "Retired Teachers as Consultants to New Teachers."

One group of school/college cooperative programs addresses the study of science or teachers of science in grades K-12. One example was submitted by New Jersey Institute of Technology, "Junior High/Middle School Science Improvement Project." Another was submitted by Northern State University in South Dakota, "The Children's lab: Elementary Teachers Moving Toward Scientific Literacy." Other school/college programs include "Adopt-A-School Program" from Pennsylvania State University Erie, the Behrend College and Virginia Commonwealth University's program in which university athletes work with youth in the public schools, "Athletes Coaching Teens (ACT)."

Almost a third of the programs submitted under the institutional administration focus were in the area of student access or retention. College students and prospective college students were the target audiences in programs such as Kentucky State University's "Plan to Attract and Prepare Minority Students for Teaching" and Chicago State University's "Student Support Services Program."

Although the chief target audience reported by participants was students, thirty-five percent noted the faculty as a major target audience. These programs varied from faculty-directed efforts to improve the curriculum to centers for improvement of teaching. Twenty-one institutions in West Virginia are cooperating in a consortium for "Faculty and Course Development in International Studies," while St. Cloud University has a model program entitled "Responsibility in Professional Life," and Southwest Texas State University reported on the "L.B.J. Institute

for the Improvement of Teaching and Learning."

Participant and User Awareness

Two surveys were conducted at the end of the second year of the project to assess the impact of the project on participants and on potential users. For this project, participants were defined as those program contacts who had submitted descriptions and whose contributions had been indexed and abstracted in ERIC. Potential users were defined as librarians in college or university libraries listed in the ERIC system directory of information service providers. Examples of the survey instruments are provided as Appendix D.

Forty participants were selected at random from the approximately ninety inventory participants whose submissions had recently been abstracted in ERIC and reported in the ERIC Journal Resources in Education. Following our evaluation plan, these individuals were invited to be our field researchers, giving us some indication of knowledge about and use of the inventory resources being located in ERIC. Twenty-two of these individuals responded.

The participants were asked to indicate their primary objective in participating in the inventory and some selected more than one objective. Thirty-three percent of the responses pointed to ERIC as an effective means of disseminating program information. Twenty-seven percent were related to a desire to help in the effort to improve cooperation among colleagues and another twenty-two percent were related to the potential of the inventory to be an effective research tool for model program replication. Fulfilling an administrator's request to submit program information was selected as an objective at a rate of 12 percent. Three percent of the responses indicated an objective of earning recognition for published work by submission to ERIC and 2 percent to the objective of disseminating one's own project.

Twelve of fourteen participants responding to a question about goal fulfillment said their goals had been fulfilled. While 11 individuals reported they had not received inquiries about their project since inclusion in the inventory, 9 said they had received such inquiries. A total of forty-one inquiries for 11 respondents were logged, for an average 3.7 requests per program. The range of inquiries was from a low of 1 to a high of 12.

While the participants in our project know about and say they value the use of ERIC, few have used it since their inventory participation and few use it regularly. Nineteen of twenty-two who responded to our evaluation survey have not located abstracts in ERIC since their program was abstracted. Thirteen of twenty said

they do not use ERIC regularly.

ERIC is most frequently used for locating literature and research reports for writing, according to our participants. Other uses include program ideas, process ideas, and locating conference papers.

Our participants have a high opinion of the inventory as a process for collecting and disseminating information. Sixteen of twenty-one thought of the inventory as either effective or very effective.

There were some good suggestions made by our participants for continued efforts to build program resources within ERIC. For example, they recommended that ERIC would be more effective if the public were more aware of it. They suggested more broadly publicizing the inventory, identifying lead program area people and creating networks and convening these networks for discussion. Finally, they suggested publishing an annual summary of all model programs in the ERIC database.

A second sample was drawn from the AASCU member institutions listed in the ERIC Directory of Information Providers, those libraries or organizations which housed search facilities for ERIC. One hundred and nine institutions received the mailing and forty-one individuals responded.

The survey developed was brief. The idea to survey these individuals developed when the project staff began to receive telephone calls from librarians who themselves were responding to requests from faculty. Since we were not sure how many librarians were familiar with the inventory, we decided to include the "notes" that ERIC created for the AASCU-submitted abstracts. These notes are printed out along with the actual program abstract when a search is done. The information in the notes describes the project and its objectives as well as the partners and funding agency.

Once we had provided our survey participants with this information we felt we had established a context for them to respond to our questions.

Thirty-four of the forty-one librarians surveyed had not heard about the project at all. Seven librarians had heard about the project and reported that their information came from press releases sent from AASCU and from their own faculty newsletter. Thirty-six of the librarian respondents had not had requests for inventory searches within ERIC; four had received such requests. Only one library respondent reported that the request was in response to information circulated about the inventory project.

Thirty-six of these respondents requested more information about the project. A total of forty letters accompanied by Parts

A and B of the inventory were mailed out to those who wanted more information.

Summary and Conclusions

The staff involved in the AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory learned a number of important lessons about the process of developing this set of resources on model programs. The project started as a partnership because we wanted to cut down on the duplication of data collection effort regarding programs and practices. We thought centering the resources in ERIC was the most cost-effective approach and we are pleased to see that FIPSE plans to submit short program descriptions from project evaluations to ERIC. However, we have learned that duplication persists.

In fact at the same time we were collecting program descriptions, William E. Vandament of the California State University System was developing the Registry of Higher Education Reform, essentially a list of innovative programs submitted by institutions. Also, Franklin Wilbur, with the support of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), was developing a directory and database of school/college cooperation projects. Each of these efforts took the better part of a year and required staff support in the development of the database, access to the program information and indexing efforts.

The second concern we had about model programs information was that within AASCU itself there was a need to improve coordination between divisions in the collection and dissemination of information. The project succeeded in locating important information in one central place and helping staff find it easily because of the work done by the database consultant. This project was clearly an approach to change a systematic way of doing things. As we assess this goal we have to report that it was not achieved to the extent desired. Staff in different divisions continue to research and develop parallel information resources due to lack of study into what is available right here. Knowing the right questions to ask is also a barrier to cooperation among divisions. However, a recent change in computer equipment and approach to networking and combining resources may go a long way to changing the thinking about centrally located and shared information.

Examining our progress on still another goal, increasing the use of ERIC by the university community, I would say we have generated some renewed interest and a little more awareness of the fact that having one's presentations and papers in ERIC can be viewed as a contribution to the publication expectations for many faculty. However, there is still a long way to go to encourage

faculty and students to see ERIC as a common tool, in the same way they use the Reader's Guide, for example.

We are especially pleased that this partnership with ERIC has acknowledged the unique efforts of the public colleges and universities in innovation. Assigning an identifier "AASCU" and a description of the inventory project to each submitted program will ensure that the purpose of the inventory project stays alive as institutions are able to match their own programming needs with the accomplishments of their peers.

Finally, we want to continue to assure that ERIC has the latest information about innovation in higher education. While it is feasible for AASCU to continue to query its members and to hand program descriptions directly to ERIC, it would also be fruitful for funding agencies to contribute descriptive resources. For example, the recent FIPSE publication on lessons learned should be continued and this plus the FIPSE annual program books submitted directly to ERIC.

However, maintaining the currency of information on these programs here at home is another matter. We are considering the extent of resources needed to continue evaluating the work already accomplished, perhaps with another evaluation survey or an update letter to all project contacts. Also under consideration is another query to administrators for program information.

As Wilbur pointed out in a recent presentation to a national conference on school/college cooperation, no one is comprehensively tracking the number of programs that come and go in a particular program area. What we tend to have is a snapshot of the activity in a given year by the submissions to inventories or questionnaires, but we do not have a sense of the lives of these projects. It is important to fund some longitudinal research on innovation to answer some of these questions.

We will continue to advise others to work with ERIC as a partner and to disseminate information about ERIC to promote its use and the use of ACCESS ERIC.

APPENDIX A

INVENTORY PARTS A AND B

PART A

AASCU/ERIC MODEL PROGRAMS INVENTORY PROJECT

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING YOUR DOCUMENT FOR INCLUSION IN THE ERIC SYSTEM

A narrative report of your program or project is required for submission to the inventory. This report should be clearly presented and contain the requested information listed below. If you had received outside funding (federal grant, etc.), the final report prepared for the funding agency would be a good basis for your submission. All submissions should be at least five pages in length -- with no upper limit.

Guidelines and Requested Information

1) Cover Page: Includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the title of the program, the name of the institution, project contact information, the funding agency and grant number, and the program's starting date.

2) Abstract: Preferably a one-page statement summarizing the important points that will be written in the narrative. Because ERIC follows rigorous standards in abstracting documents included in its monthly abstract journal, Resources in Education, the abstract you submit will likely differ from the final copy.

3) Introduction: An overview of what will be included in your submission, and, if applicable, an overview of related literature or similar projects.

4) Background: A statement of the need(s) or problem that prompted the inception of your project or program.

5) Description: Should include information about the focus, scope, and goals of the program, the target population, staffing requirements, and costs.

6) Results: What were the major findings from your program (stated descriptively and/or statistically, as applicable)? If your project is ongoing, what are the interim findings and how were they measured? Who did the evaluation?

7) Conclusions and Recommendations: Based upon the results of the evaluation, how effective is/was the program? What recommendations, if any, were made to maintain the focus and goals? How well was the program budgeted? How viable would it be for this program to be replicated at another college or university?

(Over)

Legibility and Reproducibility

Since ERIC will film the reports for inclusion in the ERIC microfiche collection, legibility is crucial. The report may be typeset, typewritten, photocopied, or prepared with desktop publishing, as long as it will reproduce clearly. Black ink on white, 8 1/2" by 11" paper is preferred.

Documents printed on a dot matrix pinter may be difficult to reproduce and, therefore, may not be accepted by ERIC. If using a dot matrix printer, be sure that the quality of the print is such that reproducibility is guaranteed.

Fees and Royalties

None

Reproduction Release

Please sign the reproduction release at the bottom of the last page of the Program Characteristics Summary (Part B). This signature allows ERIC to film your report for both microfiche and paper reproduction. **This does not affect your copyright and does not prevent you from publishing the same material elsewhere.**

SEND TWO COPIES OF BOTH THE PROGRAM NARRATIVE (PART A) AND THE PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS SUMMARY (PART B) TO:

AASCU
AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project
One Dupont Circle, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036-1192
(202) 293-7070

(Rev. 6/19/89)

PART B

AASCU/ERIC MODEL PROGRAMS INVENTORY PROJECT

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS SUMMARY

Project/Program Title: _____
Institution: _____
Department or Campus Unit: _____

NOTE: *THE CATEGORIES UNDER EACH SECTION ARE NOT EXHAUSTIVE. WRITE ANY REMARKS NEXT TO THE CHARACTERISTICS CHOSEN. ALSO, PLEASE FEEL FREE TO ADD YOUR OWN CATEGORIES WHERE "OTHER (SPECIFY)_____" APPEARS.* ***CIRCLE ALL APPLICABLE FOR A - K.***

A. PROJECT/PROGRAM FOCUS

Academic Focus

001 Articulation
002 Basic Skills/General Education
003 Continuing Education
004 Curriculum Development/Reform
005 Education for Economic/Technological Challenges
006 Ethics
007 International Education
008 Intercultural Education
009 Remedial Education
010 Student Outcomes Assessment
011 Training (Specify) _____
012 Other (Specify)_____

External Relations Focus

101 College/School Cooperation
102 Community Relations
103 Corporate Relations
104 Governmental Relations (Federal)
105 Public Relations
106 State Relations
107 Other (Specify)_____

Facilities Planning Focus

201 Energy Conservation
202 Environmental Health/Safety
203 Facilities Construction
204 Housing Management
205 Renovation
206 Other(Specify)_____

Institutional Administration Focus

301 Accreditation, Institutional or Programmatic
302 Admissions, Enrollment Management
303 Information Services Management
304 Legal Services
305 Student Access/Retention
306 System Structure, Management and Governance
307 Telecommunications Systems
308 Transportation
309 Wage and Salary Administration
310 Other (Specify)_____

Institutional Development Focus

401 Annual Giving
402 Cooperative Arrangements
403 Development
404 Strategic Planning
405 Other (Specify)_____

Personnel Focus

501 Affirmative Action
502 Personnel Evaluation
503 Recruiting Policy
504 Other (Specify)_____

Program Administration Focus

601 Career Planning/Placement
602 Continuing Education Management
603 Counseling Services
604 Instructional Technology Utilization
605 Program Planning and Evaluation
606 Other (Specify)_____

Other Project/Program Focus

701 (Specify)_____

B. PROJECT/PROGRAM DISCIPLINE

Adapted from the CIP categories used by the National Center for Education Statistics
Please note that the list is not completely alphabetized.

001 Agribusiness and Agricultural Production
002 Agricultural Sciences
003 Renewable Natural Resources
004 Architecture and Environmental Design
005 Area and Ethnic Studies
006 Business and Management
007 Business-Administrative Support
008 Business-Marketing and Distribution
009 Communications
010 Communications Technologies
011 Computer and Information Sciences
012 Consumer, Personal, and Related Services
013 Education
014 Engineering
015 Engineering/Related Technologies
016 Foreign Languages
017 Health-Allied Health
018 Health Sciences
019 Home Economics
020 Home Economics-Vocational
021 Industrial Arts
022 Law
023 Letters
024 Liberal/General Studies
025 Library and Archival Sciences
026 Life Sciences
027 Mathematics
028 Military Sciences
029 Military Technologies
030 Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies
031 Parks and Recreation
032 Basic Skills
033 Citizenship/Civic Activities
034 Health-Related Activities
035 Interpersonal Skills
036 Leisure and Recreational Activities
037 Personal Awareness
038 Philosophy and Religion
039 Theology
040 Physical Science
041 Science Technologies
042 Psychology
043 Protective Services
044 Public Affairs
045 Social Sciences
046 Construction Trades
047 Mechanics and Repairers
048 Precision Production
049 Transportation and Material Moving
050 Visual and Performing Arts
051 All Disciplines
052 Not Applicable
053 Other (Specify)_____

C. MAJOR TARGET AUDIENCE

001 Administration
002 Faculty
003 General Public
004 Local Community
005 Parents
006 Primary/Secondary Schools
007 Students
008 Other (Specify) _____

D. SPECIAL TARGET POPULATION

001 Black
002 Hispanic
003 Native American
004 Other Ethnic Minority (Specify)
_____
005 Aged/Aging
006 Disabled/Handicapped
007 Disadvantaged
008 Limited English Proficient (LEP)
009 Gender (Female or Male)
010 Other Special Target Population (Specify)
_____
011 All Minorities
012 No Special Target Population

E. PROJECT/PROGRAM SCOPE

001 Department/Campus Unit
002 International
003 Institutional
004 Local
005 National
006 Regional
007 Rural
008 State
009 System
010 Cultural
011 Other (Specify) _____

F. FEDERAL SOURCES OF PROJECT/PROGRAM FUNDING

001 Administration on Aging (AOA)
002 Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA)
003 Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE)
004 Health Careers Opportunities Programs (HCOP)
005 National Endowment for the Arts (NEA)
006 National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH)
007 National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)
008 National Science Foundation (NSF)
009 Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA)
010 TRIO
011 Title III
012 Other (Specify) _____
013 Not Applicable

G. NON-FEDERAL SOURCES OF PROJECT/PROGRAM FUNDING

001 Corporate Donation
002 Endowment
003 Foundation
004 Institution Supported
005 Private Donation
006 State Appropriation
007 State Grant
008 Other (Specify) _____
009 Not Applicable

H. PROJECT/PROGRAM START DATE

_____/_____/_____
Month Day Year

I. PROJECT/PROGRAM END DATE
(Actual or Projected)

_____/_____/_____
Month Day Year

J. PROJECT/PROGRAM ANNUAL BUDGET $_____

K. PROJECT/PROGRAM STATUS

001 Original Funding Active
002 Original Funding Ended--Program Continued with Other External Resources
003 Original Funding Ended--Program Continued with Institutional Resources
004 Original Funding Ended--Project/Program Completed
005 Original Funding Ended--Project/Program Suspended Temporarily
006 Program/Project Active Under Original Institutional Support
007 Other (Specify) _____

L. ERIC DOCUMENT HISTORY

Have you ever submitted information on your project/program to ERIC? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, please provide the following information, if known:

ERIC Identification Number (ED or EJ Number): _____
Title of Document: _____
Author(s) of Document: _____
Date of Publication: _____

Was ERIC used for research during the planning phase of your program/project?

Yes_____ No_____ Don't Know_____

M. PROJECT/PROGRAM CONTACT(S)

Name(s) _____ Title _____
_____ Title _____
Institution _____
Department/Campus Unit _____
Street Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____
Phone (____) _____ Ext. _____

N. CONTACT INFORMATION FOR OTHER MODEL PROGRAMS AT YOUR INSTITUTION

(1) Contact Name _____
Campus Unit/Department _____
(2) Contact Name _____
Campus Unit/Department _____
(3) Contact Name _____
Campus Unit/Department _____

IMPORTANT!

O. REPRODUCTION RELEASE

I understand that my signature at the bottom of this page provides ERIC with legal permission to reproduce in microfiche and paper copy the document submitted as part of the AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory project.

Signature _____ Title _____
Institution _____ Date _____

PLEASE SEND TWO COPIES OF YOUR PROJECT DESCRIPTION (PART A) AND TWO COPIES OF THE COMPLETED PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS SUMMARY (PART B) TO:

AASCU
AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project
One Dupont Circle, Suite 700
Washington, D. C. 20036-1192

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: David A. Cornicelli (202) 293-7070

APPENDIX B

SPECIAL REPORTS IN

Memo: to the President

Special Report

April 5, 1989

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Update: AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project

Phase I: AASCU, in collaboration with the ERIC Clearing House on Higher Education, has been awarded a grant from the Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) to establish and test a model system for collecting and disseminating information on model programs at AASCU institutions. The project goals are to: increase the information on model programs available to all institutions and other audiences through the ERIC system; encourage use of the ERIC system by AASCU institutions; improve AASCU's ability to know about, and to share information on, activities at member institutions; and test a model for collaboration with ERIC that other institutions of higher education might adopt.

The first phase of the project began in September 1988 with the identification of model programs at AASCU member institutions that have been federally funded since 1984. A "model program" is one that offers a unique or creative solution to a common problem or a new approach to a common concern in the education community. It is one that has been succesful within the framework for which it has been designed. Lastly, a model program may be one that could be established at other postsecondary schools. Model programs are not limited to academic programs. Any area of institutional function or operation that supports the institutional mission and concerns educational opportunity is of interest in this project.

After an extensive solicitation process, the first phase of the AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project is now coming to an end. Starting in November, a mailing was sent to 850 programs to inform them of AASCU's grant from FIPSE and the general scope of the project. This, in turn, was followed by the necessary guidelines for writing the program summary that ERIC will catalog and the program characteristics summary AASCU will use to create an in-house database. Since the response to this request was small, a second letter was sent as a reminder. Consequently, we have received around 90 submissions.

Sharing Information: The most important reason for submitting a program description to the AASCU/ERIC project is dissemination of information. ERIC announces its accepted documents to approximately 2000 organizations through its monthly abstract journal, Resources in Education (RIE), and distributes microfiche of the documents to more than 750 current subscribers to the ERIC microfiche collection. Abstracts of documents in ERIC are also retrievable through online computer searches. By tapping the ERIC system, money as well as time could be saved by institutions researching a specific program.

In addition to providing widespread availability of information, the AASCU/ERIC project will improve AASCU's in-house information resources. AASCU maintains a number of original and national data files on topics such as institutional finance, degrees granted and enrollments. In the past, however, it has not been possible to provide an indication of unique programs at member institutions with certain characteristics. The AASCU model programs database that will be created through this project could be used interactively with these existing databases to add context and specificity to members' and staff needs for program information. For example, AASCU could search for programs on a specific project at institutions in a specific geographic region—which often correlates closely with available financial resources. AASCU could also identify model programs at specific types of institutions (e.g., urban or rural institutions), addressing a particular topic (assessment, access, faculty development, etc.) or serving a particular target population (e.g., minorities, women, adult learners, handicapped).

The database that will be created from this project will be available for use in the late spring. In succeeding *MEMO* articles, we will announce the accessibility of both the AASCU and the ERIC Clearinghouse information.

Moving into Phase II: A second solicitation will begin in April. At that time, AASCU project staff will identify five program topic areas to solicit (e.g.,teacher education, faculty development, writing, etc.). By targeting topic areas, the project staff will be able to concentrate on creating comprehensive resource files in these areas.

Before the second phase begins, though, an evaluation of the first solicitation will be conducted. A short evaluation form is being sent to fifty randomly selected institutions that chose not to reply to our request for program information. The feedback from this evaluation process will form the guidelines and procedures used in the second solicitation. Also, twenty-five of the respondent will be surveyed to generate further comments and/or suggestions regarding the program solicitation materials.

If you would like information about submitting the innovative, exemplary programs at your institutions to the AASCU/ERIC Model Inventory Project, please call David Cornicelli in AASCU's Office of Association Research at 202/293-7070. Also, if you have any questions regarding the project, please feel free to contact this office at any time.

aascu One Dupont Circle • Suite 700 • Washington, DC 20036 • 202 293-7070

Contributing Departments and Offices at AASCU-Member Institutions

Troy State University, Office of Student Development/Student Affairs
Auburn University at Montgomery, Center for Rehabilitation Resources
Jacksonville State University, College of Education, School of Liberal Arts
University of Alaska, Anchorage, Justice Curriculum
California State University, Dominguez Hills, Department of Health Sciences
California State University, Fullerton, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, Department of Biology
Sonoma State University, Biology Department, School of Natural Sciences
California State University,Los Angeles, Office of Student Services
San Diego State University, College of Sciences, School of Teacher Education, College of Education, Department of Natural Sciences, College of Arts and Letters
California State University, Chico, Office of Higher Education
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, College of Arts
California State University, Northridge, Center for Cancer and Developmental Biology
Colorado State University, Department of Occupational Therapy, Office of International Programs
Gallaudet University, Department of Mathematics and Computer Sciences
University of South Florida, Division of Education Resources
Kennesaw State College, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
Augusta College, School of Arts and Sciences
Lewis-Clark State College, Department of Continuing Education
Idaho State University, College of Education
Illinois State University, Center for Education Finance, Department of Mathematics, Office of International Studies
Ball State University, College of Business, Center for Teaching and Learning, College of Business
Pittsburg State University, Department of Social Sciences
Kentucky State University, College of Arts and Sciences, College of Leadership Studies
Northern Kentucky University, Office of Student Affairs, Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Philosophy
Louisiana State University in Shreveport, Department of History and Political ScienceGrambling State University, School of Social Work
University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Division of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry
Coppin State College, Department of Fine and Communication Arts, Department of Continuing Education
Towson State University, College of Education, Department of Mathematics
Fitchburg State College, Office of Academic Affairs
Massachusetts College of Art, Undergraduate Studies
Northern Michigan University, Office of Academic Affairs
Eastern Michigan University, Learning Resources and Technologies
University of Missouri, St. Louis, Department of English, Center for Academic Development
Central Missouri State University, Department of Chemistry and Physics
Montclair State College, Institute for Critical Thinking
New Jersey Institute of Technology, Pre-College Programs and Distance Learning
Thomas A. Edison State College, Office of Prior Learning Assesment
CUNY, Graduate School & University Center, Center for Advanced Study in Education
CUNY, Hunter College, Department of Educational Foundations and Counseling Programs, Department of Psychology
CUNY, College of Staten Island, Department of Applied Sciences, Office of the Dean of Humanities and the Social Sciences
CUNY, Queens College, Department of English
SUNY, College at Old Westbury, Department of American Studies
SUNY, College at Buffalo, Department of Psychology
East Carolina University, School of Education
University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Gerontology Program
Appalachian State University, Learning Assistance Program
Wright State University, Office of Student Affairs, School of Medicine
Bowling Green State University, Office of Continuing Education
Youngstown State University, Department of English
Eastern Oregon State College, Library Sciences
Portland State University, Office of Special Services
Oregon State University, OSU-WOSC School of Education
West Chester University of Pennsylvania, Writing Programs
Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Department of Education
Lincoln University, Physics and Pre-Engineering Program
Rhode Island College, Office of Academic Affairs
Black Hills State College, Office of Student Affairs, College Development Center
Memphis State University, Center for Research on Women, University College
Austin Peay State University, Department of Psychology
University of Houston, Clear Lake, School of Education
Virginia Commonwealth University, Department of Mathematical Sciences
James Madison Univeristy, Office of Academic Affairs
Radford University, College of Arts and Sciences
Central Washington University, Department of Bilingual Education
University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire, School of Nursing Office of Graduate Studies and University Research, Department of Social Work
University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh, College of Education and Human Services
University of Wisconsin, Whitewater, Management Computer Systems
West Virginia State College, General Education Program, College of Arts and Sciences
West Virginia University, Department of Political Science

Special Report

February 2, 1990

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Second "Call": college/university public affairs programs and projects

The AASCU/ERIC Model Program Inventory Project is now interested in receiving information on the innovative, exemplary ways in which member institutions strengthen their reputation in their respective communities and state, become more visible and useful to their on-campus constituents, and support college/school cooperation as well as corporate and government relations. All AASCU vice presidents of college/university affairs will receive a companion letter to this solicitation along with the materials (Part A & B) necessary to submit a description of these projects/programs next week.

A narrative report of the program or project is required for submission to the inventory. This report should be clearly presented and should contain the requested information listed on Part A, the Program Narrative Guideline Sheet, of the submission materials.

Information about your program is also required in the format found on Part B of the submission materials. Part B is referred to as the Program Characteristics Summary (PCS). The PCS is a checklist of characteristics from which the data will be entered into AASCU's in-house database. The PCS also contains the reproduction release statement all project directors must sign granting ERIC authorization to microfiche and abstract the program submission.

To request both the Program Narrative Guideline Sheet and the Program Characteristic Summary or inquire about model programs in a specific area, contact: David A. Cornicelli, AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project, One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036.

Please Route To:

- ❑ President/Chancellor
- ❑ Chief Academic Affairs Officer
- ❑ Chief Public Affairs Officer
- ❑ Chief Fiscal Officer
- ❑ Chief Inst. Advancement Officer
- ❑ Chief Student Affairs Officer
- ❑ Chair, Faculty Senate

Project Update: AASCU/ERIC model programs inventory project

The AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory is happy to announce the inclusion of the following project descriptions into the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. An abstract of each of the submissions has been published in the October 1989 issue of ERIC's monthly journal, Resources in Education (RIE). The Clearinghouse acquires nearly 20,000 new documents to review each year for possible selection for the ERIC database, and accepts 68 percent of these submissions. All prospective participants in the inventory received the ERIC guidelines for submitting a document into the clearinghouse. The selection criteria used by ERIC, which includes such characteristics as content relevance, objectivity, technical adequacy, timeliness, and reproducibility, are the same guidelines used by AASCU on the Part A section of our submission materials.

The AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project is funded with a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, in collaboration with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education at the George Washington University. One of the goals of the project is to improve the educational community's ability to know about, and share information on, activities at comparable institutions. It is also the project's goal to encourage the use of ERIC as a cost-effective tool in the research and development of future institutional programs.

With the ERIC ED#s listed, faculty and researchers can obtain descriptions of the projects from the ERIC system or call the project contacts directly.

Space limitations have prevented us from printing the entire list of contacts, however, they will appear in the next inventory update.

Project Contacts

Harriette C. Buchanan
Videotutoring via AppalNet
Learning Assistance Program
Appalachian State University
ED306846 704/262-2291

Rosemary DePaolo
Augusta College Humanities Program: Strengthening an Intro Three-Course Sequence
Office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences
Augusta College
ED306892 404/737-1738

Dr. Anthony Golden
Project for Area Concentration Achievement Testing
Psychology
Austin Peay State University
ED306863 615/648-7451

Linda F. Annis
A Center for Teaching and Learning
Center for Teaching and Learning
Ball State University
ED306855 317/285-1763

Joanna R. Wallace
M.B.A. by Television
College of Business
Ball State University
ED306932 317/285-1931

Betty Marie Anderson
Academic Skills Center
Student Affairs
Black Hills State College
ED306859 605/642-6259

Dr. Michael Moore
Arts Unlimited
Office of Continuing Education
Bowling Green State University
ED306904 419/372-8181

Dr. Richard C. Jacobs
Interdisciplinary General Education Program
College of Arts
Calif. State Polytechnic Univ., Pomona
ED306869 714/869-2322

Wendel B. Wickland
WINTERIM
Faculty and Staff Development
SUNY, College at Buffalo
ED306886 716/878-4328

Janet R. Summerville.
Community Action Volunteers in Education CAVE/
California State University, Chico
ED306883 916/895-5817

Dr. Linda R. Anderson
Interdisciplinary Internationally Oriented/ Faculty Resource Teams
International Programs
California State University, Fullerton
ED306851 714/773-2137

Beatriz Encinas
The Talent Search Program
Student Services
California State University, Los Angeles
ED306884 213/343-3190

Dr. Steven B. Oppenheimer
Advances in Biologocal Science
Dept. of Biology, Ctr for Cancer Devel
California State University, Northridge
ED306930 818/885-3356

Dr. Michael H. Powers
Teacher, Industry, and Environment
Department of Chemistry and Physics
Central Missouri State University
ED306912 816/429-4948

Dr. Minerva Lopez-Caples
Bilingual Education Programs
Bilingual Department
Central Washington University
ED306913 509/963-1071

Jean S. Griswold
Foreign Language Camps
International Studies
Colorado State University
ED306927 303/491-5917

Jean S. Griswold
An Introductory Seminar for Foreign & U.S. University Students
Office of International Studies
Colorado State University
ED306864 303/491-5917

Jean S. Griswold
Supplemental Language Study Program
Office of Foreign Languages & Literature
Colorado State University
ED306917 303/491-5917

Pat Sample
Grace Bean
Secondary Education Transition Model
Occupational Therapy, College of A.H.S.
Colorado State University
ED306914 303/491-5930

Furlong John
The Maryland Center for Thinking Studies
Continuing Education
Coppin State College
ED306879 301/333-7840

Dr. Delores G. Kelley
Coppin Critical Reading Project
Department of Fine & Communication Arts
Coppin State College
ED306852 301/333-7458

Gold J. Milton
Retired Teachers as Consultants to New Teachers
Ctr for Advanced Study in Ed/Grad U Ctr
CUNY and Board of Ed of New York City
ED306928 212/716-2190

Michele Paludi
Minorities Access to Research Careers
Psychology
CUNY, Hunter College
ED306860 212/772-5681

Dr. Joan BuxBaum
Curriculum to Train Rehab Counseling M.A. Students in Alcoholism Counseling
Dept of Ed. Foundations/Counseling Prgm
CUNY, Hunter College
ED306853 212/772-4755

Pill Jay Cho
Minority Management Internship in Aging
School of Social Work
Grambling State University
ED306881 318/274-2369

Carol M. Stenson
Saturday Afternoon Free
Counselor Education/Special Education
Idaho State University
ED306909 208/236-3156

Angela Luckey
League of Schools
College of Education
Idaho State University
ED306931 208/236-3203

Dr. Alba G. Thompson
Dr. Carol Thornton
Illinois State University Model Middle School Mathematics Program
Mathematics Department
Illinios State University
ED306922 309/438-8781

G. Alan Hickrod
MacArthur/Spencer Special Project on Educational Finance
Dept of Education Admin/Foundations
Illinois State University
ED306903 309/438-5405

Dr. JoAnn McCarthy
Internationalizing the Curriculum
Office of International Studies/Programs
Illinois State University
ED306854 309/438-5365

Joe M. Miller
Using Law Enforcement Personnel in Drug Free School & Community Education
School of Social Sciences
Pittsburg State University
ED306880 316/231-7000

Catherine Batsche
Undergraduate Writing Program
English Department
Illinois State University
ED306841 309/438-2922

Dr. John Butzow
IUP Spring Hill Commission
College of Education
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
ED306915 412/357-2480

Reva Fine Holtzman
A Geriatric Clinical Training Model with Alzheimer Patients and Caregivers
School of Social Work
CUNY, Hunter College
ED306899 212/452-7037

APPENDIX C

LIST OF PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

AASCU / ERIC
MODEL PROGRAMS INVENTORY PROJECT

ALABAMA

Auburn University at Montgomery
- CRR Model Intervention Program

Jacksonville State University
- Teaching/Learning Center

Troy State University
- The Writing Center
- Interactive Video Training and Development Activity
- Writing Across the Curriculum
- Computer Based Articulation Program for Junior College Students

ALASKA

University of Alaska, Anchorage
- Minorities and Justice Careers

ARIZONA

Northern Arizona University
- Construction Services at Northern Arizona University

ARKANSAS

Southern Arkansas University
- BSIT: SAU's Non-traditional Extension Program

CALIFORNIA

California State Polytechnic Univ., Pomona
- Interdisciplinary General Education Program
- Center for Science and Mathematics Education (CSME)

California State University, Chico
- Community Action Volunteers in Education (CAVE)
- Bilingual Education: Education Personnel Training Program
- International Agricultural Training Projects
- Central America Project of Undergraduate Scholarship
- California International Studies Project
- Pacific Basin Studies Thematic
- Bilingual Education Paraprofessional Training Program
- Central American Partnership Program
- Freshman General Studies Thematic

California State University, Fullerton
- Interdisciplinary Internationally Oriented/Faculty Resource Teams

California State University, Long Beach
- Psychiatric/Mental Health Clinical Practitioner Program
- MARC Undergraduate Research Training Program NIH-MARC
- International Integration of California State University, Long Beach
- Clinical Training Grant for the Development of Minority/Disadvantaged Students
- Psychiatric/Mental Health Clinical Practitioner Program
- Minority Management Training Program

California State University, Los Angeles
- The Talent Search Program

California State University, Northridge
- Advances in Biological Science

California State University, Stanislaus
- Institute for International Studies

San Diego State University
- Retired Military Fast Track Program
- Educational Bridges to Options in High Technology Employment
- Center for Latin American Studies
- San Diego High School Science Teacher Development Program
- Masters of Arts in Liberal Arts
- Hispanic Ethnic Competence Project
- Comprehensive Bilingual Teacher Training -- Recruitment, Retention, Training

San Diego State University, Dept of Ed.
- Teacher Education Institute

Sonoma State University
- Impact of Hazardous Materials on Humans and the Environment
- Materials and Assistance for Science Teaching

COLORADO

Colorado State University
- An Introductory Seminar for Foreign & U.S. University Students
- Foreign Language Camps
- Supplemental Language Study Program
- Secondary Education Transition Model

Metropolitan State College
- Institute for Intercultural Studies and Services

University of Northern Colorado
- Music Technology and Resource Center
- Teacher Induction Partnerships Program

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Gallaudet University

- NSF Summer Inst in Math for PreCollege Teachers of Deaf/Hard of Hearing Students

FLORIDA

Florida International University

- Health Science Recruitment and Retention Program
- Adapting Nursing to Enhance Nurse/Patient Relations by Meeting Needs of the Community
- Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad Program
- Southeast Florida Center on Aging

The University of South Florida

- The Open University

The University of West Florida

- Career Fair: It's Your Choice -- The Economics of Career Selection

GEORGIA

Augusta College

- Augusta College Humanities Prgm: Strengthening an Intro Three-Course Sequence

Kennesaw State University

- Leadership Kennesaw

IDAHO

Idaho State University

- League of Schools
- Saturday Afternoon Free

Lewis-Clark State College

- Partnerships for Rural Revitalization
- Mastery in Learning Project

ILLINOIS

Chicago State University

- Instructional Technique-Strategy Assistance
- Academic Enrichment Project for Disadvantaged Students
- Student Support Services Program
- Entrepreneurial Awareness Program

Illinois State University

- Illinois State University Model Middle School Mathematics Program
- Internationalizing the Curriculum
- MacArthur/Spencer Special Project on Educational Finance
- Undergraduate Writing Program

Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
Student Leadership Development Program
Rape and Sexual Abuse Care Center Model Program
Alcohol and Drug Awareness Program

Western Illinois University
Enrollment Management: A Campus Response

INDIANA

Ball State University
A Center for Teaching and Learning
M.B.A. by Television

Indiana University at Kokomo
Off-Campus Career Assessment

KANSAS

Pittsburg State University
Annual Foundation Phonathon
Using Law Enforcement Personnel in Drug Free School & Community Education

Washburn University
TASK Approach to Child Care Competency

KENTUCKY

Kentucky State University
Whitney M. Young, Jr. College of Leadership Studies
Managerial Training as a Correlate of Professional Development Among Public Managers in KY Gov't.
Integrative Studies
Plan to Attract and Prepare Minority Students for Teaching
Building a Successful Fund Raising Prgm for a Small/Public/Hist Black Univ 82-89

Murray State University
Expanding the University Environment in Rural Communities

Northern Kentucky University
Grad*Star (A Woman's Educational Equity Act Program)
First Floor Design Studio
Degree Program in Applied Sociology/Anthropology

LOUISIANA

Grambling State University
Minority Management Internship in Aging

Louisiana State University in Shreveport
American Studies Program

MARYLAND

Coppin State College
- Coppin Critical Reading Project
- The Maryland Center for Thinking Studies
- The Coppin-Hopkins Humanities Program

Towson State University
- The Applied Mathematics Laboratory
- Integrating the New Scholarship on Women Into Introductory Survey
- Teacher - Research Institute

University of Maryland System
- Office of Public Service

University of Maryland, Baltimore
- Child and Adolescent Psychiatry Training Program

MASSACHUSETTS

Fitchburg State College
- Campus-Wide Assessment Week and Annual Development Day @ Fitchburg State College

Massachusetts College of Art
- THE DATA EXPANSION PROGRAM: Moving "Minority Art" into the Mainstream

MICHIGAN

Eastern Michigan University
- Center for Instructional Computing

Northern Michigan University
- Commission on the Future of Northern Michigan University

Western Michigan University
- Michigan Institute for Human Resource Development
- Gerontology and Drug and Alcohol Abuse/Misuse Training for Specialists
- The Computer Academy
- The Behavioral Systems Analysis Project
- Steam Trap Survey & Maintenance Program
- CLIOTUTOR: Local Application of Computer-Assisted Instruction in History

MINNESOTA

St. Cloud State University
- Responsibility in Professional Life

Winona State University
- Graduate Induction Program

MISSISSIPPI

Jackson State University
- Critical Thinking and Outcomes Measures Program

MISSOURI

Central Missouri State University
- Teacher, Industry, and Environment

University of Missouri, St. Louis
- Composing, Computers and Contexts
- Restructuring Intro Biology According to the Learning Cycle Instructional Strategy
- Bridge Program

MONTANA

Western Montana College
- Strengthening Institutions Program
- Big Sky Telegraph
- Rural Teacher Education Improvement Project

NEBRASKA

Chadron State College
- Pilot Project: Regional Course Sharing Through Technology

Wayne State College
- Lifestyle Improvement Program for Seniors

NEW JERSEY

Glassboro State College
- Collaborative Model for Minority Recruitment and Retention
- The Glassboro State College Retention Program

Montclair State College
- Educational Opportunity Fund Legal Studies Program
- Project THISTLE: Thinking Skills in Teaching and Learning

New Jersey Institute of Technology
- Junior High/Middle School Science Improvement Project

Ramapo College of New Jersey
- Literary Historical and Philosophical Foundations of the Law

Stockton State College
- Arts and Humanities
- Project Impact

Thomas A. Edison State College
- Portfolio Assessment

NEW MEXICO

Eastern New Mexico University

Bilingual/Multicultural Education and Counseling Program

Student Academic Services: Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Working Together

NEW YORK

CUNY and Board of Ed of New York City

Retired Teachers as Consultants to New Teachers

CUNY, College of Staten Island

"Cultura e Commercio"

CUNY, Hunter College

Minorities Access to Research Careers

Curriculum to Train Rehab Counseling M.A. Students in Alcoholism Counseling

A Geriatric Clinical Training Model with Alzheimer Patients and Caregivers

Training Minority Students for Work in Underserved Areas

CUNY, Queens College

Municipal Solid Waste Recycling System, Development and Pilot Test

ESL Student and the Study of American Culture

SUNY, Empire State College

Individualized Education at Empire State College

SUNY, College at Buffalo

WINTERIM

Infant/Preschool Specialization Program

SUNY, College at Cortland

College Success: A Transitional Course for Freshmen

Skills Center

Center for Minority and Women Studies

SUNY, College at Fredonia

College Intern Program

Clinical Field Supervisor Program

SUNY, College at Old Westbury

Project Turning Point

SUNY, Institute of Technology at Utica/Rome

New York Association of Long Term Care Administrators

Satellite Uplink and Distance Education Project

A Proactive Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Program

Using Computer Graphics in the 90's

General Electric -- Structured Analysis and Design Training

Performance Evaluation -- Non-Teaching Professionals

The City University of New York
The CUNY Transfer Express Project

NORTH CAROLINA

Appalachian State University
Videotutoring via AppalNet

East Carolina University
Model Clinical Teaching Program

University of North Carolina at Asheville
Fostering Coherence in an University-Wide Humanities Program
Health Promotion Program

University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Code of Student Academic Integrity
Motivation Materials for Junior High School Physical Science
A Field-Oriented Soil Science Short Course
An Undergraduate Interdisciplinary Program in Gerontology

University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Honors Workshop for Middle School Teachers
Graduate Language Institutes in French and Spanish
Project Archimedes

Western Carolina University
Task Force on Teaching Effectiveness

NORTH DAKOTA

Mayville State University
Development at a Small Rural University

OHIO

Bowling Green State University
Arts Unlimited

Cleveland State University
Greater Cleveland Educational Development Center

University of Akron
Strive Toward Excellence Program

Wright State University
WRIGHT STEPP (Wright State University Engineering Preparatory Program)
Weekend Intervention Program
International Student Exchange Program
Positive Adolescents Choices Training

Youngstown State University
English Festival
ARETE: Ohio Board of Regents, Early English Assessment Grant

OREGON

Eastern Oregon State College
Online Reference and Document Delivery Service Library Network

Oregon St. Univ./Western Oregon St. College
Quality Assurance Program: Beginning Teacher Clinic

PENNSYLVANIA

Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
Project Success
Disabled Student Services
Project Engage

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
The Western Pennsylvania Educators Inter-Cultural Experience in Nigeria
Pre Teacher Assessment Project
The Benjamin E. Mays Academy of Scholars
Foreign Language and International Studies for Elementary Teachers (FLISET)
IUP Spring Hill Commission
Expansion of Computer Education in Learning the Sciences (ExCELS)

Lincoln University of Pennsylvania
Lincoln Advanced Science and Reinforcement Program (LASER)

Mansfield University of Pennsylvania
Rural Services Institute

Penn State Erie, The Behrend College
Penn State Educational Partnership
Adopt-A-School Program: Penn State-Behrend/Diehl Elementary

Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania
Faculty Professional Development Program

Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania
Learning Together: An Interactive Approach to Tutor Training

West Chester University of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania Writing Project
Cross-Disciplinary Writing Program

RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island College
- Personal Learning Plan

SOUTH CAROLINA

University of South Carolina at Aiken
- Walter F. O'Connell Economic Enterprise Institute

SOUTH DAKOTA

Black Hills State University
- Academic Skills Center

Northern State University
- The Honors Program
- Canterbury Tales Institute
- Improvement of Under Prepared Mathematics and Science Teachers
- International Business Program
- The Children's Lab: Elementary Teachers Moving Toward Scientific Literacy
- Computer Aided Art-Fine Arts

TENNESSEE

Austin Peay State University
- Project for Area Concentration Achievement Testing

East Tennessee State University
- Student Services

Memphis State University
- University College
- Research Clearinghouse & Curriculum Integration Project on Women of Color/South

TEXAS

East Texas State University
- Meadows Principal Improvement Program

Lamar University
- A Lending Library of Physics Demonstrations

Midwestern State University
- President's Excellence Club

Southwest Texas State University
- L.B.J. Institute for the Improvement of Teaching and Learning
- General Studies Advancement Examinations in Writing and Mathematics
- Classroom Management and Discipline Program

Texas Woman's University
- Family Housing and Services

University of Houston, Clear Lake
Parent Education Model

University of North Texas
Emergency Administration and Planning Institute

University of Texas-Pan American
Center for Entrepreneurship and Economic Development

VERMONT

Castleton State College
Soundings: An Introduction to the Liberal Arts

VIRGINIA

George Mason University
Doctorate of Arts in Community College Education

James Madison University
Initiatives for Excellence

Old Dominion University
TAC-5 Project (Technical Assistance Center)
U.S.A. - U.S.S.R. Youth Summit
Tonelson Teaching and Learning Center

Radford University
Appalachian Studies Program

Virginia Commonwealth Univ/Med College of VA
Behavioral Pediatric Training Program
Geriatric Live Interactive Teleconferencing

Virginia Commonwealth University
Athletes Coaching Teens (ACT)
Promoting Fun in Physics
School - University - Mathematics (SUM) Program
Young Scholars Program
Minority High School Student Research Apprentice Program
Project Gold

WASHINGTON

Central Washington University
Bilingual Education Programs

Eastern Washington University
Single Parent Project

WEST VIRGINIA

21 Higher Ed Inst. in West Virginia
The West Va. Consortium for Faculty & Course Development in International Studies, FACDIS

Marshall University

H.E.L.P. (Higher Education for Learning Problems)

Search Committee on Recruitment of Excellent Students (S.C.O.R.E.S.)

West Virginia State College

Course Development for a New General Education Curriculum

Politically Correct and Expedient Economic Impact Studies

WISCONSIN

University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire

Establishment of an Off-Campus Baccalaureate Nursing Program

Critical Thinking and Values Analysis Across the Disciplines

University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh

Project Success

University of Wisconsin, Stout

Centers for Enhancement of Education

University of Wisconsin, Whitewater

Key Success Factors for an Undergraduate Computer Information Systems Program

University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point

International Resources Management

APPENDIX D

EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

EVALUATION OF RESPONDENTS
SURVEY QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Respondents: A short survey was also designed to assess the perceptions of those who had responded to our solicitation for program information. A random sample of fifteen was chosen from the ninety-nine complete program submissions. These submissions represent the success of the first phase of the AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project. This survey was conducted entirely over the telephone. The questions, responses and comments are as follows:

1) How did you become familiar with the AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project?

15 information was mailed to us
_____ information was given to us from another department/office
_____ we requested information
_____ other:

2) Did you give the solicitation to another office/department that had a functioning program that you thought should be included in this project?

5 yes 10 no

3) How many different program descriptions did your office/department send AASCU to be included in this project?

14 one
1 two
_____ three
_____ four
_____ other

4) How likely is it that you will send new program information for this project in the future?

1 likely 11 uncertain 4 unlikely

5) Did you feel you had enough time to complete both the program narrative and the program characteristics summary under the deadline?

11 yes 4 no

6) What would have been a more convenient time to have received this program information request?

10 the timing was not inconvenient
2 other: Fall/Winter
3 other: Summer
_____ other:

7) Was your submission compiled especially for this project or did you have the requested program information on file?

13 specially compiled 2 had on file

8) Did you feel limited or misdirected with the program summary guidelines (Part A)? How could it be improved?

6 yes 9 no

Comments: "Kind of confusing to read -- specifically, how big should each section be and what for?"
"Streamline it."
"It looked intimidating at first."

9) Did you feel limited with the choices presented on the Program Characteristics Summary (Part B)? Do you understand how the information from the PCS will be used?

0 yes 15 no

Comments: "Wasn't sure what the in-house database will actually do. Will I have access to it?"

10) Do you already have a network set-up with other institutions to share information on model programs?

3 yes 12 no

Comments:

11) Do you have access to the ERIC system?

13 yes 2 no

12) Do you or your office/dept. ever use the ERIC system for research?

8 yes 7 no

13) Are the goals and subsequent information that will be gathered and made available through this project clear?

10 yes 5 no

Comments: "Should stress primary source aspect of abstracts"

14) Was the explanation of what constitutes a "model" program unclear?

1 yes 14 no

15) Was there any information you could have provided but did not feel was requested or appropriate to this project?

2 yes 13 no

Comments: "Hard to limit what should be included when a project has been so successful for a couple years."

16) The AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project solicitation for information was:

13 clear/adequate
2 somewhat confusing
0 confusing

17) Which of the following statements best approximates your feelings about the AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project?

15 worthwhile and functional
0 indifferent
0 useless and a waste of grant money

18) Would you be interested in being a "field worker" for this project? That is, would you be willing to note in your files how many times you are contacted for program information as a result of this project?

5 yes 4 no 6 uncertain

EVALUATION OF NONRESPONDENTS
SURVEY QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Nonrespondents: A short survey was designed (attached as Appendix E along with the cover letter) and mailed to a random sample of 51 nonrespondents. Since the original model programs inventory request for information was never returned by these individuals, we could not assume that the evaluation response rate would be very high by simply waiting for the evaluations to be returned. Consequently, those receiving the survey were asked to review the questions and then to expect a telephone call from AASCU to collect their responses. The questions and responses are as follows:

1) Are you familiar with the AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project?

28 yes 23 no 0 did not respond

2) Did you receive the solicitation for a description of your model program?

29 yes 22 no 0 did not respond

3) Have you sent a program description (Part A) and the Program Characteristics Summary (Part B) to AASCU?

2 yes 49 no 0 did not respond

4) Although the solicitation was sent to this office/department, it was given to another office/department that had a functioning or more qualified model program.

10 yes 39 no 0 did not respond

5) Rank the importance of the following statements as they played a role in your decision **NOT** to participate in the AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project.

1 = Important 2 = No bearing

a. We would not consider any of our programs as being model or uniquely functional.

5 Important 21 No bearing 25 did not respond

b. We do not want to share information on our program at this time.

4 Important 22 No bearing 25 did not respond

c. We already have a network set-up with other institutions to share information on model programs.

0 Important 26 No bearing 25 did not respond

d. We prefer to do our own research and development when establishing a new/innovative program.

1 Important 25 No bearing 25 did not respond

e. The time required to respond was insufficient.

19 Important 10 No bearing 22 did not respond

f. The guidelines for the program summary were too restrictive.

3 Important 23 No bearing 25 did not respond

g. The guidelines for the program summary were not applicable.

4 Important 22 No bearing 25 did not respond

h. We do not have access to the ERIC system.

1 Important 25 No bearing 25 did not respond

i. We rarely use the ERIC system.

6 Important 20 No bearing 25 did not respond

j. The goal and subsequent information that will be gathered and made available from this project seem unimportant.

1 Important 25 No bearing 25 did not respond

k. The explanation of what constitutes a "model" program was unclear.

7 Important 19 No bearing 25 did not respond

l. The goal and subsequent information that will be gathered and made available through this project are not clear.

5 Important 22 No bearing 24 did not respond

m. Our institution discouraged participation in this project.

1 Important 25 No bearing 25 did not respond

n. The timing of the request for information was bad.

20 Important 8 No bearing 23 did not respond

o. Comments: no comments

6) How likely is it that you will send program information for this project in the future?

34 likely 13 uncertain 1 unlikely 3 did not respond

7) Was there any information requested that you could not provide?

3 yes 12 no 36 did not respond

8) Was there any information you could have provided but did not feel was requested or appropriate to this project?

0 yes 15 no 36 did not respond

9) The AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project solicitation for information was:

9 clear/adequate
16 somewhat confusing
0 confusing
26 did not respond

10) Which of the following statements best approximates your feelings about the AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project?

43 worthwhile and functional
8 indifferent
0 useless and a waste of grant money
0 did not respond

AASCU/ERIC MODEL PROGRAMS INVENTORY PROJECT

Project Contact Evaluation

---

1) What was your primary objective when submitting program information to the inventory? Chose up to three.

[ ] To fulfill the Academic Vice President's or Department Chair's request that you submit program information;
[ ] ERIC was felt to be an effective means of disseminating program information;
[ ] Submission to ERIC is counted as published work in tenure evaluation;
[ ] The inventory has the potential to be an innovative, effective research tool for model program replication;
[ ] To help in the effort to improve the cooperation among colleagues and institutions of higher education.
[ ] Other _____

_____

2) Has your goal/objective been fulfilled? How can the project better address your expectations? _____

_____

_____

3) Have you received any outside inquiries about your program/project since your inclusion in the inventory? [ ] Yes [ ] No

If yes, how many inquiries have you received? _____

4) Have you located your or any other project abstract through the ERIC network since the ED#s have been assigned?

[ ] yes [ ] no

5) Do you use ERIC regularly? [ ] yes [ ] no

6) If/when you use ERIC, what do you use it for? _____

_____

_____

7) Our goal for this Project is to collect and disseminate information on model, innovative, and exemplary projects and programs at AASCU institutions. In your opinion, how effective do you believe the inventory can be in the dissemination of model program information?

[ ] very effective [ ] effective [ ] somewhat effective

8) What suggestions do you have for building a comprehensive set of program resources within ERIC or any other network/clearinghouse?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Direct questions/comments to:

Meredith Ludwig
Office of Association Research
AASCU
One Dupont Circle, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7070

AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project

The AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory is a two-year project seeking to establish and test a model system for collecting and disseminating information on model programs at AASCU-member institutions--375 of the public four-year colleges and universities in the United States.

The four objectives of the project are:

- o To increase the information on model programs available to all institutions through the ERIC system
- o To encourage the use of the ERIC system by AASCU institutions
- o To improve AASCU's ability to know about, and share information on, activities at member institutions, and
- o To test a model for collaboration with ERIC that other national organizations might adopt.

The AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project is funded with a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, in collaboration with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education at The George Washington University.

1) Have you had requests for model program searches of ERIC?

[ ] yes [ ] no

2) Do you know if these requests are in response to information circulated about the AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project?

[ ] yes [ ] no

3) Have you heard about the Project? [ ] yes [ ] no

Did the information come from our press releases, faculty newsletter or a direct request for a search?

_____

_____

4) Would you like to receive more information? [ ] yes [ ] no

5) Comments _____

_____

_____

Name _____

Institution _____